

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 U-HAUL CO. OF NEVADA, INC., *et al.*,

11 Plaintiffs,

Case No. 2:12-CV-00231-KJD-RJJ

12 v.

ORDER

13 GREGORY J. KAMER, LTD., *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

15
16 Plaintiff U-Haul Co. of Nevada, Inc. (“U-Haul”) filed a Motion for Reconsideration (#100).
17 Defendants Gregory J. Kamer, Ltd. (“Kamer”) and Debra Wilcher (“Wilcher”) responded (##103
18 and 107 respectively). Plaintiff replied to both (##108 and 112 respectively). Plaintiff also
19 supplemented its Motion (#155). Additionally, before the Court is Defendant Wilcher’s Motion to
20 Strike Plaintiffs’ Supplement to Motion for Reconsideration of Order Denying Motion to Remand
21 (#156). Defendant Kamer joined the Motion (#158), Plaintiff responded (#159) and Defendant
22 Wilcher replied (#176).

23 **I. Motion for Reconsideration**

24 At bottom, Plaintiff petitions this Court to reconsider its prior order denying remand to the
25 state courts because all federal claims and parties have now been dismissed. All parties correctly note
26 that it is within the Court’s discretion to retain or decline jurisdiction in this matter. Satey v.

1 JPMorgan Chase & Co., 521 F.3d 1087, 1091 (9th Cir. 2008). In making its decision, this Court
2 looks to “the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity[.]” Carnegie-Mellon
3 Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 (1988).

4 This case has been on-going for more than six years, the vast majority of which has been
5 spent in the federal courts. Further, this matter has proven to be hotly contested at every turn. This
6 has led the Court not only to engage this matter in substantial depth, but has made remand a heavy
7 burden for any receiving court. Rather than impose such a burden on the state courts after nearly six
8 years of litigation in the federal courts, and rather than interrupt discovery which has been ongoing in
9 this Court for some time, the Court elects to retain jurisdiction in this matter.

10 II. Motion to Strike

11 The Court reminds all parties that conformity to all relevant Rules, including the Rules of the
12 Case, are integral to the competent practice of law. Nevertheless, given the minimal scope and
13 content of the supplement, Defendants’ Motion to Strike (#156) is denied.

14 III. Conclusion

15 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider (#100) is **DENIED**; **IT**
16 **IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion to Strike (#156) is **DENIED**.

17 DATED this 15th day of August 2013.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26



20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Kent J. Dawson
United States District Judge